REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application. No claim amendments are presented, thus no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-6, 8-11, 14-19, 21-26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Tamagaki (U.S. Patent 5,716,148); Claims 7, 20 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Tamagaki in view of Akiyama et al. (U.S. Patent 6,771,378, hereinafter "Akiyama"); and Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Tamagaki in view of Sato et al. (U.S. Patent 6,667,812, hereinafter "Sato").

The outstanding Official Action rejected Claims 1-6, 8-11, 14-19, 21-26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Tamagaki. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as independent Claims 1, 8, 14, 21 and 28 recite novel features clearly not taught nor rendered obvious by the applied reference.

Independent Claim 1 relates to status information printing program configured to be run on a host computer, and which causes the host computer to print printer status information based on status data received from a printer. The program monitors for status information output from a printer, and acquires the status information upon detecting an output from the printer. The program then generates printing data to print status information data, which is output to the printer for subsequent printing.

Specifically, independent Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that the program of the host computer, causes the host computer to:

> ...monitor the output initiation structure for the status information that the printer outputs through the two-way communication, the status information being output without solicitation from the host computer...

> generate printing data ***to print printer status information indicated by the status information data acquired by the status information acquisition function*** on the host side when the output initiation instruction is recognized by the output initiation structure and monitor function; and...
>
> output to the printer through the two-way communication the printing data generated by the printing data generation function.

Independent Claims 8, 14, 21 and 28, while directed to alternative embodiments, recite substantially similar features. Accordingly, the arguments presented below are applicable to each of independent Claims 1, 8, 14, 21 and 28.

As described in an exemplary embodiment at pp. 21-24 of the specification, printer status information is sent to the host computer when, for example, a button on the printer is pushed. The host computer receives the printer status information and generates print data to print printer status information indicated by the received status information of the printer. By such a configuration, the printer is relieved of the burden of processing raw status data to generate print data related to its own status.

Turning to the applied reference, Tamagaki describes a data printing and outputting apparatus that has a host device (70), and a digital copying machine (10) connected with the host device through a communication line for printing and outputting data.[1] The control section (55) of the digital copying machine monitors a printing operation and maintains communication between the host device and the digital copying machine. When the digital copying machine encounters a major problem, the digital copier disconnects and stops receiving data from the host device.

Tamagaki, however, fails to teach or suggest "monitoring the output initiation instruction for the status information that the printer outputs through the two-way communication, the status information being output without solicitation from the host computer," and "generating printing data to print printer status information ***indicated by the***

[1] Tamagaki, Abstract.

status information data acquired by the status information acquisition function...", as recited in independent Claim 1.

In addressing the "output initiation instruction monitor function" feature recited in independent Claim 1, the outstanding Official Action relies on col. 10, lines 1-58 of Tamagaki. The cited portion of Tamagaki, describes that the host device (70) receives a command to print image data stored in the image storage (72), and selects a digital copying machine (10) for printing. If trouble is detected at the digital copying machine (10) the controller section (67) starts a timer and controls the backup storage section (65) to store information on the print conditions, printed pages, etc. Then, the digital copying machine (10) gains access to the host device (70) to inform it of the host identification code and a data identification code, and sends a signal to inform the printing is stopped because of trouble.

Thus, the cited portion of Tamagaki describes that the status information output from the printer is an indication that the printer (10) has some type of trouble printing the data from the host device. Therefore, it is clear that the outstanding Official Action asserts this indication of trouble from the digital copying machine (10) as the "status information that the printer outputs," as recited in independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 1 also recites "a printing data generation function configured to ***generate printing data to print printer status information indicated by the status information data acquired by the status information acquisition function*** on the host side when the output initiation instruction is recognized by the output initiation instruction monitor function."

In addressing this claimed feature, the outstanding Official Action relies on col. 10, line 46-col. 11, line 6 of Tamagaki. The cited portion of Tamagaki, however, describes that when the trouble solving process is completed, the controller section (67) checks the after-

trouble conditions. If any loss of data is found in the data storage section (54), the controller section (67) determines unprinted data, and request the host to send any unprinted data.

Thus, Tamagaki clearly describes that information indicating trouble with printing may be sent from the digital copier (10) to the host device (70). Then, when the digital printer is ready to print again, the printer accesses the host device to obtain the pages that were intended to be printed but have not yet been printed.

Therefore, Tamagaki does not print ***printer status information indicated by the status information data acquired by the status information acquisition function***, as recited in independent Claim 1. Instead, the host device simply resends original data, not corresponding to the information it receives of trouble with the printing device, to the printing device to be printed.

Therefore, Tamagaki fails to teach or suggest "a printing data generation function configured to ***generate printing data to print printer status information indicated by the status information data acquired by the status information acquisition function*** on the host side when the output initiation instruction is recognized by the output initiation instruction monitor function," as recited in independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 (and the claims that depend therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn. For substantially similar reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 8, 14, 21 and 28 (and the claims that depend therefrom) also patentably define over Tamagaki.

As discussed above, Tamagaki fails to teach or suggest the above differentiated features recited in pending independent Claims 1, 8, 14, 21 and 28. Likewise, neither Akiyama nor Sato, neither alone, nor in combination remedy this deficiency, and therefore, none of the cited references teach or suggest Applicant's Claims 7, 12, 13, 20 and 27 which include the above distinguished features by virtue of dependency. Therefore, the cited

references fail to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to any of these claims.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 7, 12, 13, 20 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-28 is patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Andrew T. Harry
Registration No. 56,959

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)
ATH/rac
I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\21'S\212054-US\212054US-RR.DOC